

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,  
5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 U.S. DISTRICT COURT SAN  
8 FRANCISCO et. al.,

9 Defendants.

10  
11 Case Nos. [24-cv-7972-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8268-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8410-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8411-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8412-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8413-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8414-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8472-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8473-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8501-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8553-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8554-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8555-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8632-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8842-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8843-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8844-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8845-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8846-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8848-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8849-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8850-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8851-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8852-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8854-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8855-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8856-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-8858-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-9022-PJH](#)  
[24-cv-9024-PJH](#)

26 ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE  
27 CASES WITH PREJUDICE  
28

1 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42  
2 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas  
3 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471  
4 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In*  
5 *re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

6 Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as  
7 defendants various federal and state judges and other officials. He seeks relief regarding  
8 his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and federal  
9 courts.

10 To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases,  
11 he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is  
12 “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 28  
13 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case  
14 No. 13-0951 CW.

15 The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent  
16 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an  
17 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512  
18 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), *Demos v. U.S.*  
19 *District Court*, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or *Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court*,  
20 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with  
21 prejudice. The court notes that plaintiff has an extensive history of filing similar frivolous  
22 cases.<sup>1</sup>

23 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge’s impartiality  
24 might be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the filings.  
25 See *United States v. Holland*, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> The undersigned is the fourth judge assigned cases filed by plaintiff. This is the 70th  
28 order issued by the undersigned since April 30, 2020, pertaining to 967 different cases.  
Plaintiff filed 962 other cases with the three other judges since 2011.

1 reasons to recuse himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases  
2 assigned to that judge).<sup>2</sup>

3 The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk  
4 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: December 16, 2024

7 */s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton*

8  
9 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff names the undersigned as a defendant in one of these cases, though presents no specific allegations. See Case No. 24-8858. Plaintiff does not seek recusal, nor is recusal warranted considering the frivolous nature of the cases.